

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, the application included claims 1-41. Claims 1, 15 and 29 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-41 stand pending for examination.

Claims 1-14 and 29-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 7-15, 18, 19, 21-34 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0032687 to Huff (“Huff”).

Claims 2 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 4,501,559 to Griswold et al. (“Griswold”).

Claims 3-6, 17, 20, 35 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huff in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,429 to Kane et al. (“Kane”).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the pending 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 29 to recite a “computerized method” and sending information for display at a user computer.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the pending 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 29 to clarify “consolidation” as recited by the Applicants to be “adding information from a plurality of records determined to represent the same person to the single person record.” This is distinguishable from Huff’s consolidation which does not combine information. Hence, claims 1 and 29 are believed to be allowable, at least for the foregoing reason.

The Applicants maintain that claim 39 is allowable. Claim 39 recites “perform a relationship analysis to infer relationships among persona records using the assertions of the persona records; if a relationship is inferred, assign at least one relationship type to the relationship between the records.” The Advisory Action cites Huff’s teachings at ¶¶ [0159]-[0169] as anticipating these elements. But in discussing this rejection, the Advisory Action credits Huff with teachings that are simply not present. For example, Huff does not mention assigning relationship types. Moreover, the process being described at the cited section has to do with deleting duplicate records, not performing a relationship analysis. Hence, claim 39 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason. Claim 29 includes elements similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 39 and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above. Moreover, the independent claims include additional elements that further distinguish over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 21, 2008

/Irvin E. Branch/

Irvin E. Branch

Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB/jln
61290691 v1